

that the device can be made by a different method and that the method can be used to make a different device is not relevant to the analysis under the PCT rules.

Claims 1-9 are clearly linked by a single inventive concept. Claim 1 recites an electronic device comprising a free-standing thin film and claim 8 recites a method of manufacturing an electronic device comprising a free-standing thin film. Both claims 1 and 8 recite “an alloy of aluminum and at least magnesium.”

Ignoring both the letter and the spirit of the PCT rules, the Examiner states that the groups do not relate to a single general inventive concept because the inventive feature is known from Zhang (“Mechanical Tests of Free-Standing Aluminum Microbeams for MEMS Application”). This conclusion is clearly wrong. A careful review of Zhang makes clear that the paper does not disclose any teaching of a thin film comprising an alloy of aluminum and magnesium. In contrast to this, Zhang discusses thin films of either pure aluminum or alloys of aluminum and titanium. *See* Conclusions on page 213 (“We studied the mechanical properties as well as alloying effects of pure Al and Al-2%Ti free-standing micro beams”).

In fact, this paper is already discussed on page 1, lines 7 to 21 of the present application. Here, it is also discussed that the free-standing film of an alloy of aluminum and titanium turns out to be very sensitive to creep. A thin film comprising an alloy of aluminum and magnesium is much less sensitive to creep. This is extensively discussed in the present description and shown by various experiments. Accordingly, a thin film according to the present invention provides significant advantages over a thin film according to Zhang.

Examination of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

October 6, 2010

Date

/Ira S. Matsil/

Ira S. Matsil

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 35,272

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.

17950 Preston Rd., Ste. 1000

Dallas, Texas 75252-5793

972-732-1001 – Tel.

972-732-9218 – Fax